

Remarks

Status of application

Claims 1-11 and 13-59 were examined and stand finally rejected in view of prior art. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish Applicant's invention from the prior art. In view of the amendments to the claims and the below remarks, reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The invention

Applicant's invention enables users to collect and extract content from a number of different sources in a manner which provides real-time, interactive (i.e., user driven) content aggregation. Applicant's invention enables a user to collect various types of content components from a number of different sources (e.g., Web sites available via the Internet). The user can then create interactive messaging portlets using the collected components. An advantage of the architecture of Applicant's invention is that inter-portlet communication among messaging portlets on a given computer is handled locally without requiring interaction with a remote computer. This re

Applicant's invention includes an innovative user interface, a web application "wizard" and other tools that make it easy for users to select and collect content and use the collected components create and implement messaging portlets. Applicant's invention includes a wizard (tool) that enables a user to select a message action (from a plurality of such actions which are available) and map the selected message action to a particular portlets (or portlet components) to create a messaging portlet. A user without extensive technical skills or training can use Applicant's invention to identify, extract, retrieve, and use content in situations that previously required complex development tasks by skilled programmers.

General

A. Claim Objection

The Examiner has objected to Claim 50 on the basis that the limitation "said at least one collaborative element" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 50 as suggested by the Examiner, thereby overcoming the objection.

Prior art rejections

A. Section 102 rejection: Jerrard-Dunne

Claims 1-4, 9, 13, 14, 17-25, 30, 33-35, 38-44, 48, 51, 52, and 54-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US PGPub 2004/0090969 to Jerrard-Dunne et al (hereinafter "Jerrard-Dunne"). The Examiner's rejection of Applicant's Claim 1 as follows is representative of the rejection of Applicant's claims as anticipated by Jerrard-Dunne:

Referring to claim 1, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a method for interactive content retrieval and display at a computer [user system 26] connected to a network [network 30] and having Internet access (see Fig 1 and [0020]), the method comprising:

- providing a plurality of portlets [for example, portlets 48 A-E] selected by a user [user 32 or portlet developer] from a plurality of sources [content provider system 28] available via the Internet for retrieval of content for display (see [0026], lines 8-14; [0030]; [0036], lines 1-7) in a user interface of the computer [user system 26];
- in response to user input, mapping a message action to a first portlet to create a messaging portlet [the developer links desired fields together using a user interface] (see [0031]) for sending a message to a registrar [broker system 42] in response to user interaction with the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0036]-[0037] - when data is entered in the input field of the source portlet, the data is sent to the broker system);
- creating a listener portlet [destination portlet] by registering a second portlet [e.g., weather] selected by the user [developer] with the registrar [broker system 42] to receive messages from the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0032] and [0037], lines 6-10);
- in response to user interaction with the messaging portlet [a user 32 interacts with portlet data sharing system 10 through user system 26] (see [0025], lines 1-2 and [0036], lines 1-7), retrieving particular content for display in the user interface [content is displayed in the portal page] (see [0028]) based on the message received by the listener portlet [destination portlet] from the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0033], lines 22-25; [0036]; and [0037]); and
- displaying the particular content in the user interface [content is displayed in the portal page] (see [0028]).

Under Section 102, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in the single prior art reference. (See, e.g., MPEP Section 2131.) As will be shown below, Jerrard-Dunne fails

to teach each and every element set forth in Applicant's claims 1-4, 9, 13, 14, 17-25, 30, 33-35, 38-44, 48, 51, 52, and 54-59 (as well as other claims), and therefore fails to establish anticipation of the claimed invention under Section 102.

One significant difference between Applicant's invention and that of Jerrard-Dunne is that in Applicant's invention the messaging (broadcasting) component, the registrar, and the listener all reside within a user's web browser at a computing device (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0095] - [0096]; Fig. 4). This is specifically described, for example, at paragraph [0097] of Applicant's specification as follows:

Inter-portlet messaging is handled by the browser without requiring Web application host interaction.

(Applicant's specification, paragraph [0097], emphasis added)

Although Applicant's messaging portlets may retrieve content from a remote web server (e.g., as shown at Applicant's Fig. 4), all of the inter-portlet communication takes place within the web browser at the computer. This has several benefits. One benefit is that Applicant's approach reduces the amount of Internet bandwidth needed to deliver compound web applications. Another benefit of having all of the inter-portlet communications within the browser is that the user experience will be "faster" without trips to a backend component located on a remote computer (e.g., Web server).

In contrast to Applicant's approach, Jerrard-Dunne's system relies on use of server-side components. As shown at Fig. 1 of Jerrard-Dunne, the portlet 48 runs at a user system 26, while the mapping system 38, creation system 40, broker system 42, and conversion system 44 all reside on a separate computer system (web server) 12 (Jerrard-Dunne, Fig. 1). This is described at paragraph [0020] of Jerrard-Dunne as follows:

User system 26 and content provider system 28 are shown in communication with computer system 12 by interfacing with one or more I/O devices 22 of computer system 12 via a network 30 (e.g., LAN, WAN, Internet, etc.)....computer system 12 represents any type of computerized system for providing access to a web site (e.g., a web server), user system 26 represents any type of computerized system that can be used to access the world wide web (e.g., a mobile phone, a handheld computer, a personal digital assistant, a portable (laptop) computer, a desktop computer, a workstation, a mainframe computer etc.), and content provider system 28 represents any type of computerized system for providing data to other

systems.

(Jerrard-Dunne, paragraph [0020]).

The Examiner equates the broker component of Jerrard-Dunne's system with the registrar of Applicant's invention. However, as discussed above, in Jerrard-Dunne's system, the broker component is a server-side component located on web server while the registrar of Applicant's invention is located in the browser on the client. In addition, Jerrard-Dunne describes inter-portlet communication as follows:

...when a data value of a source field is modified, the "source" portlet sends a message to broker system 42. Broker system 42 accesses the mappings defined for the source field using mapping system 38, and sends a message to each "destination" portlet having a destination field with which the source field is shared. The message includes an identification of the destination field, and the updated data value for the destination field. When necessary, broker system 42 can use conversion system 44 to convert the data between the source field and destination field data types.

(Jerrard-Dunne, paragraph [0037])

Thus, Jerrard-Dunne's system relies on server-side components for implementing inter-portlet messaging so that communications and data type conversion can be performed without requiring additional functionality in the portlets (Jerrard-Dunne, paragraph [0038]). This is not Applicant's approach. Applicant's approach provides for adding the registrar and other components inside the browser window at the client computer for implementation of inter-portlet messaging (Applicant's specification, paragraph [0105]; Fig. 5A-B). Rather than relying on server-side components for messaging and conversion of data types, Applicant's invention provides for adding functionality to the portlets and adding the registrar at the client computer. In Applicant's system the registrar is located in the browser window on the client computer and all messaging is handled within the browser (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0095] - [0096]). Applicant's independent claims have been amended to more clearly articulate this distinction. For example, Applicant's claim 1, as amended, includes the following claim limitations:

A method for interactive content retrieval and display at a computer connected to

a network and having Internet access, the method comprising:
providing a plurality of portlets selected by a user from a plurality of sources available via the Internet for retrieval of content for display in a user interface of the computer;
in response to user input at the computer, defining a particular message action to be taken in response to user interaction with a first portlet, mapping the particular message action to the first portlet to create a messaging portlet for sending a message to a registrar in response to user interaction with the messaging portlet; wherein said registrar is located in a browser at the computer.

(Applicant's claim 1, as amended, emphasis added)

Applicant's system also serves a different role from the system of Jerrard-Dunne in that Applicant's system enables a user to collect content from a variety of different sources and technologies and use this content to create a simple web based browser application which includes interactive messaging portlets (Applicant's specification, paragraph [0093]). With Applicant's invention, the user may select (or collect) different types of content to be displayed and combine them together (e.g., on a web page). The user may then add message actions using a "mElement" wizard (web application tool) provided by Applicant's invention (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0162] - [0164]). In this manner, Applicant's invention enables an end user to select and create their own web applications. Using Applicant's invention, a user with little or no programming or web design experience can combine content and produce an interactive web application using this web application tool (Applicant's specification, paragraph [0091]). These elements of a user selecting content and adding messages action to create messaging portlets which interact to create an interactive web application on the user's computer are specifically described in Applicant's claims, including, for instance, the limitations of claim 1 set forth above.

In contrast, the user of the system of Jerrard-Dunne interacts with an application that has been previously created by a developer (Jerrard-Dunne, Fig. 1). With Jerrard-Dunne's system, a portlet developer specifies data fields as an input field, an output field, an internal field or an input/output field and defines a data type for each field (Jerrard-Dunne, paragraph [0029]). Only some of the fields can share data with other fields. For example, input fields can only receive data from another portlet, while output fields can only send data to another portlet. Internal fields can not share data. With this approach,

the portlet developer must decide in advance which of the portlets may send and received messages to each other. The portlet developer is also responsible for placing the portlets on the page, adjusting the display properties of each portlet including font, color, size, location, content, form, and so forth (Jerrard-Dunne, paragraph [0030]). Thus, with the system of Jerrard-Dunne, an end user's ability to create or customize pages of interactive portlets (e.g., for use on his or her own computer) is constrained by development choices previously made by the developer.

Applicant's invention also allows the user to use several different messaging actions or strategies for inter-portlet messaging. In creating a messaging portlet, a user can select from a plurality of messaging actions or strategies using the wizard (tool) provided by Applicant's invention (Applicant's specification, paragraph [0164]). Different messaging actions or strategies can be used based on the type of object (e.g., anchor objects, grid objects, form objects, database objects and custom objects) and the message action desired (Applicant's specification, paragraphs [0164] - [0170]). These limitations are also included in Applicant's amended claims. For example, claim 1 includes the following limitations:

in response to user input at the computer, defining a particular message action to be taken in response to user interaction with a first portlet, mapping the particular message action to the first portlet to create a messaging portlet for sending a message to a registrar in response to user interaction with the messaging portlet; wherein said registrar is located in a browser at the computer;

(Applicant's claim 1, as amended, emphasis added)

Applicant's review of the Jerrard-Dunne reference, finds no similar feature which enables a user to define different messaging actions or strategies to be used for different objects of a given portlet. Although Jerrard-Dunne's system includes a creation module of some sort, it does not include the specific features of the wizard (tool) of Applicant's invention which enables a user to select portlets, define various types of message actions to be associated with particular portlets (or components thereof), and map the defined message action to the portlets to create messaging portlets in the manner described in Applicant's specification and claims. In addition, Jerrard-Dunne's system relies on server side components for inter-portlet messaging and data type conversion, while Applicant's

solution provides for handling all inter-portlet communication locally on the client computer. Therefore, as Jerrard-Dunne does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of Applicant's claims Claims 1-4, 9, 13, 14, 17-25, 30, 33-35, 38-44, 48, 51, 52, and 54-59 (and other claims) it is respectfully submitted that the claims distinguish over this reference and overcome any rejection under Section 102.

B. Section 103(a) rejection: Jerrard-Dunne in view of Admitted Prior Art

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 6, 26, 27 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0090969 to Jerrard-Dunne et al as applied respectively to claims 4, 25 and 42 above, further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereafter AAPA).

The Examiner relies on Jerrard-Dunne as substantially teaching the claimed invention (as per the Examiner's rejection under Section 102 above), but acknowledges that Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the limitation of implementing the web page is implemented using a markup language. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the web page of Jerrard-Dunne using a markup language as disclosed by Applicant's admitted prior art.

As to these claims, Applicant believes that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons cited above (as to the Section 102 rejection) pertaining to the deficiencies of Jerrard-Dunne as to Applicant's invention. Although Applicant admits that the use of a markup language for implementing a web page is known in the art, this does not cure any of the above-described deficiencies of the primary Jerrard-Dunne reference as to Applicant's invention. Accordingly, as the prior art reference(s), even when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention as set forth by these claims is distinguishable over the combined references, and that the rejection under Section 103 is overcome.

C. Section 103(a) rejection: Jerrard-Dunne in view of Goldberg

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 28, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, 46, 47, 49, 50 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0090969 to Jerrard-Dunne et al as applied respectively to claims 1, 22 and 42

above, further in view of US PGPub 2004/0199541 to Goldberg et al (hereinafter "Goldberg"). Here, the Examiner relies again on Jerrard-Dunne as substantially teaching Applicant's claimed invention, but acknowledges that Jerrard-Dunne fails to disclose various limitations of these dependent claims, including that the messaging portlet is structured as an HTML inline frame. The Examiner adds Goldberg for each of the referenced teachings and states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Goldberg's features with those of Jerrard-Dunne.

Applicant's claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons cited above (as to the Section 102 rejection) pertaining to the deficiencies of Jerrard-Dunne as to Applicant's invention. As these claims are dependent upon, and incorporate the limitations of Applicant's independent claims, they are distinguishable for the reasons described in detail. As Goldberg does not provide any teaching of messaging portlets that cures any of these deficiencies of Jerrard-Dunne. Goldberg discusses use of IFRAME technology that allows individual items on a web page to be updated without a full-page refresh cursor commit (Goldberg, paragraph [0053]). However, Goldberg makes no mention whatsoever of messaging portlets or of using IFRAME technology for implementing messaging portlets. Instead, the messaging described in Goldberg is sending an electronic mail message of a browser-based user interface to users so as to communicate business information to such users (Goldberg, Abstract). Moreover, and as discussed above, Jerrard-Dunne specifically teaches the use of server-side components for messaging and data type conversion rather than adding this functionality in the portlets (Jerrard-Dunne, paragraph [0038]). Thus, Jerrard-Dunne "teaches away" from the idea of adding this functionality to the portlets, whether the functionality is implemented using HTML inline frames or otherwise.

Thus, as the Jerrard-Dunne reference, even when combined with Goldberg, does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention is distinguishable over these references, and that the rejection under Section 103 is overcome.

Any dependent claims not explicitly discussed are believed to be allowable by virtue of dependency from Applicant's independent claims, as discussed in detail above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and the amendment to the claims, it is believed that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Hence, it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue at an early date.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 925 465 0361.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 9, 2007

/G. Mack Riddle/

G. Mack Riddle; Reg. No. 55,572
Attorney of Record

925 465 0361
925 465 8134 FAX